MEMORANDUM

December 31, 1973

TO: Michael Phillips

FROM: Huey D. Johnson

RE: Point Grant Summary Report for the Period of January 1 through October 31, 1972

Regarding your request for a report on the initial year, I offer the following brief statements on each of the 22 grants made during that period. Before doing that I should mention that I offered a $50.00 additional grant to a number of the more activist grantees, to critique Point, the grant, etc. I attach copies from Bill Bryan, Stephanie Mills, Jim Moorman, The Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Susie Washington, and Mats Segnestam's trip from Sweden.

I will only comment on several, especially those ones which had a special impact on me.

Stephanie Mill's letter of December 18th commends the somewhat unstructured approach to giving that Point demonstrates, especially that of trusting individual instincts. "Recent events are convincing me that humans are the only reliable resources of information left. Language without the author is out of context and is increasingly meaningless. Mighty easy to lie with. Don't believe everything you read in the papers."

"But trusting individual intuition has fallen out of fashion. Thanks to science and government, many think that worth is something you can prove with numbers; that all you need is just the facts, ma'am."

From Jim Moorman - a good feeling of satisfaction when he states that the $5,000 Point grant supported a case that was one of the most successful that the Sierra Club Legal Defense fund has ever brought, and resulted in substantial reforms in National Forest practices concerning wilderness areas. From my point of view, any time you can provide a foundation grant that leads to a change in National policy, it is a remarkable act and possibly the greatest accomplishment that one could expect.

Bill Bryan's reflections are excellent. I think Bill has been one of the most impressive activists. Since we are considering another get-together, I would like to quote a paragraph from his letter. "The gathering at Foresta Institute a year ago was a great waste of time and money. No community was established, and no conscious

effort took place to help one another. For many, it was viewed as a party -- indeed a sad comment." Also, his next to last paragraph, where it says, "One final thought -- I support Point's limit on size of support given to any one agent; however, Point should make available various other resources to veteran Point agents. Often the Point agent begins something with his grant that needs some protective care." This is something that out of all our granting over the years, we are going to look back on and have to struggle with like other foundations.

Bryan has to be seen as one of the successes of our activist granting program. He's made tremendous progress in working with the Indians and the resident community regarding the challenge of strip mining (as well as many other environmental issues) and harnessing the concerned citizenry in the northern Rockies. He has also become an effective fundraiser and is functioning independently, having raised, this year, over $23,000 for his program from other sources.

Since it was just received, though it was a part of the second year's training program, I include a report from Alan Lithman on the reforestation project at Auroville. I include it because Alan was criticized for his persistance, and yet on getting his grant, provided the enclosed statement of results which are mighty impressive. Trying to sort the harrassing con artist from the dedicated idealist is, I suppose, the toughest part of giving, and I sure feel good about Alan. You'll note that 23 acres of casuarina trees have been planted at 5 sites along with jungle scrub, and each penny is accounted for. Possibly the most important part of that grant is that he'll be able to show this report and get my recommendation to other foundations should they consider giving him a grant. When he came to us, he had no track record and this certainly is a sound one for his beginning. This demonstrates the seed grant type of thing which if the seed takes root, from a small gift the kind Point provides, it can then bloom into other foundation sources once it is established as an ongoing challenge.

One other thought -- I don't feel qualified to just flatly say "good" or "bad." I think that time and a lot more research needs to be done before I can justify that. I made my decisions on "good" or "bad" when initially weighing the logic of making a grant in these cases, and have generally been very satisfied with the results. As I look at the list, I feel that we are batting .900 or better on those 22 grants over the first year that I made.

Nor will I get carried away with praise on how grand one or others may be. I have observed that Jerry, for instance, has selected what he feels is the "best" agent. This is a concept I disagree with. Before that kind of judgment is made, the project has to have more time to season.

Greg Archbald's $15,000 agent grant was instrumental in a number of areas, including the planning and launching of TPL which after a year has achieved the goals it set out to achieve. We are increasingly confident that we will have national impact on the nation's open space problem. He also pursued other areas of land policy.

Jim Morgan made unique use of his $15,000 agent grant. His message about the dilemma of the Bighorn as a symbol of mismanagement of public lands has had national coverage. He has written in a number of magazines. A recent issue of National Geographic carried his story and some photographs. I recently saw a doctoral statement on somebody's new program for a way to revamp environmental education in the nation. The fellow was looking for a grant, and he cited Jim Morgan as a classic example that he was using in his program for training teachers. I traced it down and found that he had never met Jim, but was just impressed with his story. Thus, the thought of planting a seed and having it grow on is thrilling both from the Point viewpoint and I'm sure to Jim personally.

UNIFY with Susie Washington continues to be effective. Her letter in response is attached. Susie is one of those people I will recommend for Point board consideration.

Phil Wallin did an excellent job on his study of the British National Trust and his comments are enclosed.

The Stockholm salon and the Berkeley salon can be placed together and judged to be very worthy. Stephanie is writing a magazine article on the result and agrees that it should be the kind of thing that can be accomplished on a broader scale elsewhere as well.

The Wheelwright Center -- grant to the Zen Center (SF Zen Farm) is continuing to develop.

The Center for Environmental Action supported the church-based activist group which gets good results, but not the kind of results on a national scale that I had envisioned it might.

The Good Works Collective is one of Jerry's requests for assistance.

The Environmental Research Analysis was described in the earlier report.

Barbara Bell did a study on comparative land policy in Sweden and the U. S. based on the fact that Sweden has managed to be the more progressive of the two. The results, with the little funding made available, were not complete enough to my satisfaction, and I felt it would take a great deal more money to do the kind of traveling and research needed to put together a better source of information.

The non-governmental organization Liaison Committee was an outgrowth of the Stockholm experience, and this grant was instrumental in launching a conference in New York City following Stockholm which was later followed up by a conference in Geneva. The same group will have its fourth meeting in Nairobi in March. The non-governmental organization concept of the UN Environmental Secretariat is still trying to get a footing and decide on directions, but is gaining strength as months go by.

Sandy Demarest worked on a series of case studies for use in land policy needs and training programs. She did an excellent job. She since decided to go back to school at the University of Arizona.

Mats Segnestam visited and lectured to a number of universities -- talked to key activists, etc., and had a major national impact. I think this is one of the most energy stirring grants made and it was only $1,000.

Allan Chadwick, who received several grants (an additional one after this one), has with the help of Point money moved through transitional stages and now has a major settlement going in northern California in a remote village where he is training students. He has this year been able to raise $40,000 which has established him in several buildings in the community and gotten the whole community involved in his concept. This is another major seed grant that could have tremendous positive social results.

Henry Goetz did a study of the Blackfoot River in Montana which we received a report for and turned in earlier.

Harvey Neese was a find of Jim Morgan's regarding land use problems. He used the money to get reprints of his study, copies of which were received.

Charlie Watson continues to gain strength from the Point support. He recently received an independent $5,000 grant from an eastern foundation, based to a great extent on the Point support. He and Jim Morgan have recently filed suit against BLM -- the agency that manages about a quarter of the U. S. public lands, challenging their not using environmental impact statements for grazing purposes. The effectiveness has already led to major change in the use, and, again, will probably result in major national policy changes which will benefit future generations. Charlie is a real gadfly and is one of the most delightful agents to watch as he leaves sparks along the landscape.

Best

Harry